I have already spelt out the argument for attributing the authorship of *Leucocytozoon* to Berestneff (1904) with *L. danilewskyi* (Ziemann, 1898) as its type species. Peirce is not correct in his belief (BZN **57**: 41, para. 8) that 'most authors have used *L. ziemanni* as the type species of *Leucocytozoon*'. A number of authors (non-Russian as well as Russian) have used *L. danilewskyi* as an available name and as the type species. Some of these papers were listed in my original application and in Iezhova's comment; others include Dilko (1977), Yakunin & Zhazyltaev (1977), Nandi & Mandal (1978) and Nandi (1984).

Additional References

Dilko, N.I. 1977. *Animal blood infections and their agents*. Uradzhay, Minsk. [In Russian].

Nandi, N.C. 1984. Index-catalogue of avian haematozoa from India. *Records of the Zoological Survey of India, Occasional Papers*, **48**: 1–63.

Nandi, N.C. & Mandal, A.K. 1978. Studies on some avian haematozoa from Jammu and Kashmir, India. *Bulletin of the Zoological Survey of India*, **1**: 103–106.

Yakunin, M.P. & Zhazyltaev, T.A. 1977. The blood parasite fauna of wild and domestic birds from Kazakhstan. *Trudi Instituta Zoologii AN Kazakhskoy SSR*, **37**: 124–148. [In Russian].

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 (Mollusca, Gastropoda), and the proposed emendation of spelling of TRICHIINAE Lozek, 1956 (Mollusca) to TRICHIAINAE, so removing the homonymy with TRICHIIDAE Fleming, 1821 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2926; see BZN **57**: 17–23)

L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

The case covers three homonymous generic names: *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 (for Myxomycetes), *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 (for decapod Crustacea) and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 (for gastropod Mollusca).

The oldest of the names, *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790, is that of a very well-known genus of Myxomycetes (slime fungi or slime moulds) for which it is considerably and unambiguously used; it is the type of the suprageneric names TRICHIINAE, TRICHIIDAE (or Trichiaceae) and Trichiacea. The name refers to a genus included in an ambiregnal group of organisms claimed by both mycologists and protozoologists and is thus covered by the Zoological Code as well as the Botanical one. *Trichia* was first published as a botanical name by van Haller (1768); it is available from Hoffman (1790), whose binominal work was the first to meet the zoological provisions for availability, under Article 10.5 of the Code.

Hartmann's (1840) name *Trichia* in Mollusca is not only a junior homonym of two older names (*Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 and *Trichia* De Haan, 1839), it is also a junior synonym of the name *Trochulus* Alten, 1812 (para. 5 of the application). The conservation of *Trichia* Hartmann and the family-group name TRICHIINAE Lozek, 1956 requires (a) the setting aside of the homonymy with the myxomycetan name; (b) the suppression of *Trichia* Da Haan, 1839; (c) the suppression of *Trochulus* Alten, 1812; (d) the rejection of the family-group name TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927, which is much older than TRICHIINAE Lozek; and (e) a change of spelling of TRICHIINAE Lozek under the plenary power to remove the homonymy between it and the family-group name TRICHIIDAE Fleming, 1821 in Coleoptera.

All this becomes unnecessary when the Code is followed. The only changes then would be *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 substituted by *Trochulus* Alten, 1812, and the family-group name TRICHIINAE Lozek, 1956 substituted by TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927.

The question is, is all the trouble to conserve *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 justified? So far as I know the genus is not of any importance in medicine or applied science and is best known only to taxonomists and amateur malacologists. The fact that *Trichia* Hartmann was recognized the type of a family group as late as 1956 also does not speak for a great importance of the genus. Furthermore, there is no long-standing uniformity in the use of *Trichia* for the molluscs. The name *Fruticicola* Held, 1837 was for a long time used for the type species of *Trichia* and I have always known the taxon as *Fruticicola hispida* (Linnaeus, 1758), a name used certainly beyond the middle of the 20th century (cf. para. 4 of the application). The name *Trichia* Hartmann has always been rather controversial because of the simultaneous use of *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 in Crustacea. Furthermore, *Trochulus* is not an entirely unknown name and has been used during the 20th century. The family-group name based on it (TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927) long before that based on *Trichia* Hartmann demonstrates this.

Concluding, I wish to remark that the discovery of *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 as the oldest homonym, invalidating both *Trichia* De Haan, 1839 and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840, is more or less a blessing, wiping away the controversy over priority between the crustacean and molluscan names. It means that there is no longer ambiguity over whether the crustacean or the molluscan name *Trichia* is meant, and no numerous and complicated manoeuvres by the Commission are needed to save the least deserving of the three names. In Crustacea the disappearance of the name *Trichia* has been accepted by all the workers that I contacted, and the replacement by *Zalasius* Rathbun, 1897 will not cause much confusion, especially when accepted immediately. I would expect that in Mollusca the disappearance of *Trichia* Hartmann will not do much harm, especially as the name of the genus has changed several times in its history, and a period of stability can be expected with the introduction of *Trochulus*. The latter name has not been used for other genera and there is no question of switching it from one genus to another. The only argument for starting the complicated machinery of the Commission for saving *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 is its frequent usage in the last ten years, but in Myxomycetes (or Mycetozoa) *Trichia* has clearly been used unambiguously for a much longer period of time. My plea is that in this case the Code should be strictly applied, this being the most simple and least time consuming procedure.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Polydora websteri* Hartmann in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Annelida, Polychaeta) by a ruling that it is not to be treated as a replacement name for *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, and designation of a lectotype for *P. websteri*

(Case 3080; see BZN **55**: 212–216; **57**: 43–45)

Vasily I. Radashevsky

Institute of Marine Biology, Vladivostok 690041, Russia

Jason D. Williams

Department of Biological Sciences, University of Rhode Island, 100 Flagg Road, Kingston, RI 02881–0816, U.S.A.